



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/823,404

04/13/2004

Christopher J. Nagel

2751.2001 US7

3242

38473 7590 06/29/2007
ELMORE PATENT LAW GROUP, PC
209 MAIN STREET
N. CHELMSFORD, MA 01863

EXAMINER

KOPEC, MARK T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1751

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/823,404	Applicant(s) NAGEL, CHRISTOPHER J.	
	Examiner Mark Kopec	Art Unit 1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 44-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1751

This action is responsive to applicant's amendment/remarks filed 11/07/06. Claims 44-54 are pending.

The Terminal Disclaimer filed 06/02/06 is ENTERED.

Claims 44-54 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of copending Application No. 10/659,090. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the instant claims and the (allowed) claims of 10/659,090 are drawn to copper compositions comprising certain magnetic properties (or MFM scan). The instant claims are merely broader in scope and encompass the co-pending claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

Art Unit: 1751

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitations recited in each of these claims do not find literal or inherent support in the disclosure as originally filed. Such limitations (regarding the magnetic properties of the "tailored copper") are not disclosed in the specification not are they an inherent certainty in the examples.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 48, 51, 52, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "substantially free of spots of magnetic attraction" (claim 48), "substantially no difference in Gauss readings..." (claim 51), and "essentially zero" (claims 52 and 54) are relative terms which render the claim indefinite. The terms are not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of

Art Unit: 1751

ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. When a term of degree is presented in a claim, first a determination is to be made as to whether the specification provides some standard for measuring that degree. If, as in the instant case it does not, a determination is made as to whether one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the prior art and the status of the art, would be nevertheless reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. While, as a general proposition, broadening modifiers are standard tools in claim drafting in order to avoid reliance on the doctrine of equivalents in infringement actions, when the scope of the claim is unclear a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is proper. See *In re Wiggins*, 488 F. 2d 538, 541, 179 USPQ 421, 423 (CCPA 1973).

Applicant's remarks regarding the above terminology are noted.

The examiner respectfully maintains that such language is indefinite. The skill artisan or potential infringer would be unable to determine the metes and bounds of the instant claims. When a term of degree is presented in a claim, first a determination is to be made as to whether the specification provides some standard for measuring that degree. If it does

Art Unit: 1751

not, a determination is made as to whether one of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the prior art and the status of the art, would be nevertheless reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Even if the specification uses the same term of degree as in the claim, a rejection may be proper if the scope of the term is not understood when read in light of the specification. While, as a general proposition, broadening modifiers are standard tools in claim drafting in order to avoid reliance on the doctrine of equivalents in infringement actions, when the scope of the claim is unclear a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is proper. See *In re Wiggins*, 488 F. 2d 538, 541, 179 USPQ 421, 423 (CCPA 1973). Additionally, when relative terms are used in claims wherein the improvement over the prior art rests entirely upon size or weight of an element in a combination of elements, as appears to be the instant case, the adequacy of the disclosure of a standard is of greater criticality.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1751

Claims 44-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for -
-A copper composition manufactured by exposing a starting copper composition with a purity of at least about 99.98% to an iterative cyclic process in the presence of a carbon source, wherein the manufactured copper composition is substantially free of other metals, and characterized by one or more spots of magnetic attraction to a neodymium iron boron magnet on the surface of the composition at room temperature.--, does not reasonably provide enablement for the invention as instantly claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The purpose of the requirement that the specification describe the invention in such terms that one skilled in the art can make and use the claimed invention is to ensure that the invention is communicated to the interested public in a meaningful way. The information contained in the disclosure of an application must be sufficient to inform those skilled in the relevant art how to both make and use the claimed invention. All of the pending claims are drawn to various embodiments of a copper composition possessing magnetic properties. The

Art Unit: 1751

specification does not enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make or use a "magnetic" copper composition of matter (as instantly claimed) in that it would require undue experimentation to do so.

The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be enabling. See, e.g., Chiron Corp. v. Genentech Inc., 363 F.3d 1247, 1254, 70 USPQ2d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The "predictability or lack thereof" in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. If one skilled in the art can readily anticipate the

Art Unit: 1751

effect of a change within the subject matter to which the claimed invention pertains, then there is predictability in the art. On the other hand, if one skilled in the art cannot readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which that claimed invention pertains, then there is lack of predictability in the art.

The description of magnetic properties/testing appears at pages 33-34 of the instant specification. Additionally, the specification has five examples directed to "tailored" copper. Examples 1 and 11-14 disclose detailed heating/cooling schedules for the copper metal. The examiner submits that the process disclosed in each of these examples is nearly identical. The heating/cooling times, temperatures, atmospheres, cycles and carbon source appear to be substantially identical. Each copper composition is manufactured by exposing a starting copper composition with a purity of at least about 99.98% to an iterative cyclic process in the presence of a carbon source, wherein the manufactured copper composition is substantially free of other metals.

The examiner respectfully submits that undue experimentation would await the skilled artisan attempting to make the claimed invention with materials other than those discussed above. As the specification now appears, the skilled

Art Unit: 1751

artisan would be unable to produce the claimed magnetic copper compositions without undue experimentation.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 50-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either Svensson et al (*Magnetic and electrical properties of copper-iron...*), Dovgopol et al (*Magnetic, thermodynamic, and kinetic properties of copper containing 0.4-2.0 atom% iron impurities*), or Campbell et al (*A Moessbauer study of the magnetic properties of copper-iron (CuFe) alloys*).

Svensson et al discloses Cu-Fe alloys containing 0.2-1.7 atom% Fe (Abstract).

Dovgopol et al discloses Cu-Fe alloys containing 0.4-2.0 atom% Fe (Abstract).

Campbell et al discloses Cu-Fe alloys containing 0.24-4.6 atom% Fe (Abstract).

The examiner respectfully submits that the instant limitations "substantially free of spots of magnetic

Art Unit: 1751

attraction", "substantially no difference in Gauss readings...", and "essentially zero" include the small amounts of Fe disclosed above.

The reference specifically or inherently meets each of the claimed limitations.

With respect to the prior art rejections over claims 44-49, each of the reference relied upon teaches Cu-Fe alloys with varying amounts of Fe responsible for magnetic behavior. As stated by applicant at page 7 of the response filed 11/07/06, the instant claims do not include the amounts of iron distributed through the prior art material(s) to achieve magnetism, nor is there any reason/motivation for removing iron from the prior art compositions to arrive at the instant claims.

In view of the foregoing, the above claims have failed to patentably distinguish over the applied art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will

Art Unit: 1751


expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Kopec whose telephone number is (571) 272-1319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


/Mark Kopec/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

MK
June 25, 2007